



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/749,028

12/30/2003

David V. Pedersen

P46C1-US

8287

50905

7590

02/22/2006

N. KENNETH BURRASTON  
KIRTON & MCCONKIE  
P.O. BOX 45120  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84145-0120

EXAMINER

ABRAMS, NEIL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2839

DATE MAILED: 02/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/749,028

Applicant(s)

PEDERSEN

Examiner

Neil Abrams

Art Unit

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 February 2006.  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2, 4-6, 8-16, 37 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 2, 4-6, 8-16, 37 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

The indicated allowance of certain claims is withdrawn upon reconsideration of prior art.

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the claims 2, 4 features must be shown or deleted from the claims. No new matter may be entered. Exactly which figure includes the plural socket substrates together with an unsingulated wafer is unclear. Figure 8 is referred to in this regard but features at issue are not seen. In figure 9, only one socket at 924 is seen.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner,

Art Unit: 2839

the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. Claims 2, 4-5, 8, 14-16 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood 6087845 in view of Farnworth 549566, Igarashi and Hembree.

3. Wood, figure 3 device includes an unsingulated wafer 30, a support 2 with terminals at 23 and contacts 31 in groups, readable as defining sockets, and traces, column 6, lines 64-67. Farnworth lacks elongate spring contacts on the wafer.

Farnworth discloses use of wafers with such spring contacts; figures 2, 4 and testing such devices. Obvious to use such wafer is place of Wood part 30. This would expand capabilities of the device. Term "sockets" does not require pits therefore does not overcome Wood connector at 31 if used with flat pads for engaging the spring contacts.

Should this be at issue and for claim 15, Hembree at figure 4c and Igarashi, figure 2 use pits. Obvious to use these at Wood part 31 to help align the spring contacts <sup>during testing</sup>. Basically claim 2 rejection involves use of Wood system but with change of wafer 30 to one of Farnworth type.

4. Claims 9-13 are under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood in view Farnworth, Hembree, Igarashi, applied as above, Pammer, Russel and Smith.

5. Wood lacks features recited in claims. Pammer includes cooling means 50. Russel use power lines and resistors. Smith uses a vacuum chuck. Obvious to use these in Wood for preventing damage from heat, proper circuit connection and to press parts into engagement.

Art Unit: 2839

6. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood in view of Farnworth and Hembree, Igarashi, applied as above, and Horton.

7. Wood lacks interposer use. Horton uses an interposer at 175. Obvious to use such device in a Wood to enable connection to a probe card without wires. Also note that claims 6, 9-13 do not appear separately at issue since all arguments are directed to use of wafer with elongate spring contacts and corresponding test device.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Neil Abrams at telephone number 571-272-2089

*N. Abrams*  
JEL. 03/04/04  
EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 322